## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed on May 23, 2005. Claims 1-37 are rejected. In this Amendment, Claims 1, 2, 17, 18, 19 and 34 have been amended. Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 10-15, 20, 21, 23-25, 27-32 and 35-37 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 38-43 have been added. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 29-31 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,516, hereinafter "Lee"), in view of Rojas, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,123, hereinafter "Rojas"). Claims 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 15, 20, 21, 23-25, 28, 32, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, in view of Rojas, and further in view of Cornelius, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,081, hereinafter "Cornelius"). As discussed below, the pending claims are patentable over the above reference.

Lee discloses a software tool to perform national language translation builds. The baselevel changes of the software in a first human language are tracked and stored in a library control database. Then, a report of the baselevel changes is generated including a list of all newly created files in the first human language which have not been translated into the second human language and all translated files in the second human language which are downlevel. The report permits the builder to decide whether or not to send the downlevel second language files to a national language center for translation.

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Lee does not teach or suggest maintaining language dependant code of a base version of an application separately from language independent code of the base version of the application, and facilitating the

internationalization of the base version of the application, where the internationalization includes pseudo localization of the language independent code of the base version of the application. Neither does Lee teach or suggest facilitating a localization of the base version of the application, where the localization includes generating a base glossary for the language dependent code. Thus, Lee does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 1:

> ...storing a base version of the application in a base language, wherein language dependant code of the base version of the application is maintained separately from language independent code of the base version of the application;
> facilitating an internationalization of the base version of the application, wherein the internationalization comprises pseudo localization of the language independent code of the base version of the application; and
> concurrently facilitating a localization of the base version of the application, wherein the localization comprises generating a base glossary for the language dependent code, the base glossary being translated into at least one language different from the base language.

These features are also included in independent claims 18 and 34. Thus, claims 1, 18 and 34 are patentable over Lee.

Rojas does not help Lee to render the present invention unpatentable. Rojas discloses a method for testing translatability of software. This method converts single-byte base-language data and performs a mock translation on it to produce internationalization test data which takes the form of the corresponding base-language data transliterated into and displayed using a double-byte character set to create double-wide characters. This data is stored in localization files and displayed in a software application in place of the English or foreign-language text. By visually inspecting each screen, the programmer or proofreader is able to recognize internationalization errors, without requiring the ability to read any foreign languages.

Similarly to Lee, Rojas does not teach or suggest at least maintaining language

dependant code of a base version of an application separately from language independent code of the base version of the application, and facilitating a localization of the base version of the application, where the localization includes generating a base glossary for the language dependent code. Thus, Rojas lacks the same features that are missing from Lee. Accordingly, Lee and Rojas, taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the presently claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection and submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

## Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
&-ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: September 23, 2005

Marina Portnova
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,750

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8598